

City of Springfield
Work Session Meeting

MINUTES OF THE JOINT ELECTED OFFICIALS
WORK SESSION MEETING HELD
MONDAY, JUNE 20, 2005.

The City of Springfield Council and Lane County Commissioners met in a work session in the Library Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, June 20, 2005 at 6:00 p.m., with Mayor Leiken and Commissioner Chair Anna Morrison presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mayor Leiken and Councilors Ballew, Fitch, Lundberg, Woodrow and Pishioneri and Commissioner Chair Morrison and Commissioners Sorenson, Stewart and Green. Also present were County Administrator Bill VanVactor, City Manager Mike Kelly, Assistant City Manager Cynthia Pappas, City Attorney Joe Leahy, Administrative Coordinator Julie Wilson and members of the staff.

Councilor Ralston and Commissioner Dwyer were absent (excused).

1. Proposed Metro Plan Diagram Amendment, Concurrent Glenwood Refinement Plan Diagram Amendment, Glenwood Refinement Plan Text Amendment Establishing Designation, Zoning, and Development Policies, and Amendment to the Springfield Development Code for the Area Known as "Subarea 8: The River Opportunity Area" in the Glenwood Refinement Plan, Excepting the Parcels South of the Railroad Tracks.

The Lane County Commissioners already held a first reading on this item. The Springfield City Council will hold a second reading on this topic on July 18, 2005.

Springfield City Planner Susanna Julber presented the staff report on this item. Also present were Otto Poticha, Jim Hanks and Nicolai Krueger.

The package of amendments necessary to adopt a redevelopment process for the Glenwood Riverfront, which the council initiated on September 20, 2004, is now before the Springfield City Council and Lane County Board of Commissioners. The Amendments will allow the development of Subarea 8 into a land use pattern which includes a mix of residential, office, and commercial uses along the Glenwood Riverfront, as well as allow the flexibility to respond to a changing market through a Master Plan Modification procedure.

Susanna Julber provided background and brief information regarding this topic. She presented changes in the form of a power point presentation and answered brief questions from the group. See Agenda item summary packet for details regarding the suggested amendments.

The Mixed Use/Nodal Development Metro Plan and Refinement Plan diagram designations are effective upon adoption of this amendment. The remainder of the Amendments, including Article 44 of the Springfield Development Code, and zoning districts consistent with the policies of the Refinement Plan, are applied as the properties within the Project Area are annexed into the City.

The Springfield Planning Commission made a recommendation for approval of the Amendments, with some recommended changes on May 18, 2005, with a vote of 6-0. The Lane County

Planning Commission made a recommendation for approval, with some recommended changes, on May 17, 2005, with a vote of 4-1-1. These changes are addressed in Attachment 2.

No specific development is approved pursuant to the Joint Elected Official's approval of the Amendments. A second reading of the Ordinance before the Springfield City Council is scheduled for July 18. The Lane County Board of Commissioners had a first reading on the amendments on June 1, 2005. The Joint Elected Officials may elect to keep the record open at this June 20 meeting.

Otto Poticha provided additional information presented in the power point presentation. He explained the proposal was a framework for the project. He discussed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and the design for Franklin Boulevard. He discussed the McVey and Franklin area and the importance of being aware of traffic concerns.

The issue of transients was briefly discussed. A councilor asked what improvements might be made at or under the bridge to address this issue. Mr. Poticha said they have been working with the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) regarding this traffic flow. He discussed the "business end" of traffic. An access management plan had been worked on for ODOT. The ODOT storm sewer was discussed.

Mr. Poticha pointed out the proposed BRT station, which was approximately one square block in size.

Ms. Julber explained that the plan proposed was conceptual at this point and other factors would be incorporated in the plan.

Mr. Poticha said two economic consultants were asked to provide an opinion of what Glenwood could support economically. He shared a model of Phase I. He said with Phase I, you could have access to it at this time. The regional commercial model was pointed out. He also discussed the proposed highway commercial area.

Mr. Poticha provided an overview of the Phase I model from a different view and further reviewed the proposal from several viewpoints.

Ms. Julber reviewed other points related to the following:

- Procedural History
- Suggested Changes to Document (see Attachment I)
 - Incorporate housekeeping amendments
 - Incorporate suggested height maximum of 90 feet within GR Plan District.
 - Add requirement to proposed language found at SDC 44.120 that implements a height maximum of 35 feet development adjacent to the Willamette River. This requirement was provided in earlier versions of the GR Plan District language, but was omitted from the final version.
- Prohibit free standing wireless communication towers (this 48 acre area / Glenwood)
- Prohibit key card lock facilities
- Add transit to the list of amenities for Franklin Blvd such as sidewalks, bike lanes and planter strips.

- Omit the allowance of Campus Industrial in Article 44, as the list of allowable uses for Mixed Use Employment (MUE) will allow most of the employment-oriented opportunities within the GR Plan District.
 - Mayor Leiken said this elected body may support this but what occurs if/when new elected bodies are in place. He asked if mixed use employment would confuse this over the long term. We don't want to have a concern regarding interpretation of mixed use. Campus Industrial has been consistent for a long time. We need to look at overall economy. If this is something we can clarify and state so it is interpreted the same as campus industrial is, we should consider this. Ms. Julber said if we want to identify campus industrial you could do that or a plan amendment. Mr. Poticha said the way it is currently setup, you follow the plan.
- The Lane County Planning Commission (LCPC) recommended approval of the proposed Amendments at the June 7, 2005 meeting, however, had concerns regarding the proposed riparian setback of 75 feet for all development within the GR Plan District. The commissioners forwarded a recommendation to the board for a 100 foot setback, instead of the 75 foot setback in the proposed amendment.
 - Ms. Julber discussed the issue and concern regarding potential Measure 37 claims if a 100 foot setback was included. The analysis of the 100 foot setback had not yet been done. Mr. Poticha discussed the 100 year flood plain. The wording would be that it would be an average of 75 feet for the riverfront master plan. Environmental consultants had examined this area and cross sections had been made. Following their analysis, it was determined that a 75 foot average could be used. If someone wanted to do something as a master plan, such as expand on their own, they might have one building they need to construct on their property. The setback would be 75 feet from the top of the bank. If someone came in with a master plan for development, some variation could occur if other drainage options were used. Those plans would need to be reviewed. The plan Mr. Poticha proposed could vary from the average 75 feet setback. Ms. Julber said she was recommending council approve the package of amendments including the recommendation suggested by staff and the Springfield and Lane County Planning Commissions as noted in Attachment 1, page 3, G Section 2 of 75 foot setback. That is outlined in Exhibit D-1 under the Glenwood Riverfront (GR) Plan District language that goes in the Springfield Development Code. She noted that the amendment would be adopted by ordinance rather than resolution as stated on Attachment 2, page 13.
- Ms. Julber reviewed the proposed plan diagram change to mixed use/nodal development. She discussed section 8. She referenced the mobile home park and why their property was not made as part of Subarea 9. If amendments as adopted, the two tax lots will not be any part of any subarea. It is proposed they are part of Subarea 9 or 8. At that time when they redevelop they would need to undergo master plan amendments the same as Subarea 8. Any applicant for amendment in Subarea 8 will be treated the same. Zoning in Subarea 8 is not changed.

Ms. Julber said the ordinance was written to leave out the portion south of the railroad tracks. If it was their desire to leave them in Subarea 8, she could take that section out of the ordinance.

A council member recognized the efforts of staff and others that have worked on this project.

Mayor Leiken appreciated the fact that staff was working on this project and continuing to be flexible in proposals.

Mr. Poticha thanked the group for their interest.

ADJOURNMENT

The Springfield City Council adjourned at approximately 6:56 pm.

The Lane County Commissioners called for a recess at approximately 6:56 pm until the Public Hearing.

Minutes Recorder: Julie Wilson

Sidney W. Leiken
Mayor

Attest:

Amy Sowa
City Recorder